

NEW JERSEY MILITIA NEWSLETTER

Volume VII, Issue No. X

April 2002

All persons are by nature free and independent, and have certain natural and unalienable rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and of pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness.

-- Article 1, Section 1, New Jersey State Constitution

The Favorite Factoid

By David Kopel

Perhaps the most enduring factoid of the gun prohibition movement is that a person with a gun in the home is 43 times as likely to shoot someone in the family as to shoot a criminal. This "43 times" figure is the all-time favorite factoid of the gun-prohibition lobby. It's not really true, but it does tell us a lot about the gun-prohibition mindset.

The source of the 43-to-1 ratio is a study of firearm deaths in Seattle homes, conducted by doctors Arthur L. Kellermann and Donald T. Reay ("Protection or Peril?: An Analysis of Firearm-Related Deaths in the Home," *New England Journal of Medicine*, 1986). Kellermann and Reay totaled up the numbers of firearms murders, suicides, and fatal accidents, and then compared that number to the number of firearm deaths that were classified as justifiable homicides. The ratio of murder, suicide, and accidental death to the justifiable homicides was 43 to 1.

This is what the anti-gun lobbies call "scientific" proof that people (except government employees and security guards) should not have guns.

Of the gun deaths in the home, the vast majority are suicides. In the 43-to-1 figure, suicides account for nearly all the 43 unjustifiable deaths.

Counting a gun suicide as part of the increased risk of having a gun in the home is appropriate only if the presence of a gun facilitates a "successful" suicide that would not otherwise occur. But most research

suggests that guns do not cause suicide.

In the book *Point Blank: Guns and Violence in America*, Florida State University criminologist Gary Kleck analyzed suicide data for every America city with a population more than 100,000, and found no evidence that any form of gun control (including handgun prohibition) had an effect on the total suicide rate. Gun control did sometimes reduce gun suicide, but not overall suicide.

Notably, Japan, which prohibits handguns and rifles entirely, and regulates long guns very severely, has a suicide rate of more than twice the U.S. level. Many of the northern and central European nations also have very high suicide rates to accompany their strict gun laws. (Of course, if you have any suspicion that anybody in your home might be suicidal, it would hardly be a mistake for you to ensure that they do not have ready access to guns, tranquilizers, or other potentially lethal items.)

Putting aside the suicides, the Kellermann/Reay figures show 2.39 accidental or criminal deaths by firearm (in the home) for every justifiable fatal shooting. Now, 2 to 1 is a lot less dramatic than 43 to 1, but we still have more unjustifiable gun deaths than justifiable gun deaths in the home.

But just as many other people who would commit suicide with a gun would use an equally lethal method if guns are unavailable. Many of the people who kill themselves in firearm accidents may also be bent on destruction, regardless of the means. One study of gun-accident

victims found that they were "disproportionately involved in other accidents, violent crime, and heavy drinking." (Philip Cook, "The Role of Firearms in Violent Crime: An Interpretative Review of the Literature," in *Criminal Violence*).

Or, as another researcher put it, "The psychological profile of the accident-prone suggests the same kind of aggressiveness shown by most murderers." (Roger Lane, "On the Social Meaning of Homicide Trends in America," in *Violence in America*, Vol. I, 1989.)

Without guns, many accident victims might well find some other way to kill themselves "accidentally," such as by reckless driving.

So by counting accidents and suicides, the 43-to-1 factoid ends up including a very large number of fatalities that would have occurred anyway, even if there were no gun in the home.

Now, how about the self-defense homicides, which Kellermann and Reay found to be so rare? Well, the reason that they found such a low total was that they excluded many cases of lawful self-defense. Kellermann and Reay did not count in the self-defense total of any of the cases where a person who had shot an attacker was acquitted on grounds of self-defense, or cases where a conviction was reversed on appeal on grounds related to self-defense. Yet 40% of women who appeal their murder convictions have the conviction reversed on appeal. ("Fighting Back," *Time*, Jan. 18, 1993.)

In short, the 43-to-1 figure is based on the totally implausible assumption that all the people who

die in gun suicides and gun accidents would not kill themselves with something else if guns were unavailable. The figure is also based on a drastic undercount of the number of lawful self-defense homicides.

Moreover, counting dead criminals to measure the efficacy of civilian handgun ownership is ridiculous. Do we measure the efficacy of our police forces by counting how many people the police lawfully kill every year? The benefits of the police and of home handgun ownership are not measured by the number of dead criminals, but by the number of crimes prevented. Simplistic counting of corpses tells us nothing about the real safety value of gun ownership for protection.

Finally, Kellermann and Reay ignore the most important factor of all in assessing the risks of gun ownership: whose home the gun is in. You don't need a medical researcher to tell you that guns can be misused when in the homes of persons with mental illness related to violence; or in the homes of persons prone to self-destructive, reckless behavior; or in the homes of persons with arrest records for violent felonies; or in the homes where the police have had to intervene to deal with domestic violence. These are the homes from which the vast majority of handgun fatalities come.

To study these high-risk homes and to jump to conclusions about the general population is illogical. We know that possession of an automobile by an alcoholic who is prone to drunk driving may pose a serious health risk. But proof that automobiles in the hands of alcoholics may be risky doesn't prove that autos in the hands of non-alcoholics are risky. Yet the famous Seattle 43-to-1 figure is based on lumping the homes of violent felons, alcoholics, and other disturbed people in with the population as a whole. The study fails to distinguish between the large risks of guns in the hands of dangerous people, with the tiny risks (and large benefits) of guns in the hands of ordinary people.

But then again, treating ordinary people according to standards that would be appropriate for criminals and the violently insane is what the gun control movement is all about.

The Concord Hymn

By Ralph Waldo Emerson

1837

By the rude bridge that
arched the flood,
Their flag to April's breeze
unfurled;
Here once the embattled
farmers stood;
And fired the shot heard
round the world.

The foe long since in silence
slept;
Alike the conqueror silent
sleeps,
And Time the ruined bridge
has swept
Down the dark stream that
seaward creeps.

On this green bank, by this
soft stream,
We place with joy a votive
stone,
That memory may their
deeds redeem,
When, like our sires, our
sons are gone.

O Thou who made those
heroes dare
To die, and leave their
children free, —
Bid Time and Nature gently
spare
The shaft we raised to them
and Thee.

The Minstrel Boy

By Thomas Moore

1779-1852

The Minstrel Boy to the war
is gone,
In the ranks of death you'll
find him;
His father's sword he has
girded on,
And his wild harp slung
behind him, --
'Land of song!' said the
warrior-bard,
'Though all the world
betrays thee,
One sword, at least, thy
rights shall guard,
One faithful harp shall
praise thee!'

The Minstrel fell! – but the
foeman's chain
Could not bring his proud
soul under;
The harp he loved ne'er
spoke again,

For he tore its clouds
asunder;

And said, 'No chains shall
sully thee,

Thou soul of love and
bravery!

Thy songs were made for
the pure and free,

They shall never sound in
slavery.'

Gun Owners Have Every Reason To Worry

By Clarence E. Lovell

We have every reason to
worry about our gun rights. The
enemy is us, the National Rifle
Association. The NRA bureaucracy is
still in control. Nothing's changed.

Unaccountable NRA
Washington, D.C., outsiders dictate
our instate politics. Arrogant NRA
Field Reps. manage clotured groups
of scheming, exhibitionist, self-
appointed spokesmen. #1

History repeats. The NRA
bureaucracy and their clubhouse
politicians destroyed the members'
1977 CINCINNATI REVOLT. The
bureaucracy ran, runs and will
continue to run the NRA.

The NRA remains a
sportsmen's elitist social club. NRA's
political concern still is sporting
activities. NRA still lacks concern for
the constitutional rights of citizens.
CHECK THE RECORDS.

In 1982-83, with protective
exemption of sporting use of arms,
the NRA-B'nai B'rith Deal accepts the
Anti-Defamation League's anti-
paramilitary legislation. NRA rejects
protecting survival and self-defense
training. In 1984 NRA defeats my
effort to undo their B'nai B'rith
agreement.

Since accepting Government
licensing of machine guns in 1934,
#2 the NRA's 1986 FIREARM
OWNERS' PROTECTION ACT
practically ends the right to get, own
or transfer an automatic firearm. #3

In 1986 NRA set the legal
precedence to prohibit or restrict
ammunition. #4

The Police tell THE TRUTH
ABOUT ARMOR PIERCING AMMO. #5
"it was the NRA, not the anti-gun
groups, that gave us a sensible,
workable, armor-piercing bullet
law." "NRA moved quickly to protect
hunters and recreational shooters."
"NRA helped draft legislation that
defined and restricted the
availability of armor-piercing
ammo."

In 1989. I sensed a NRA do nothing attitude toward efforts to ban semiautomatic firearms. Wayne Stump seconded my motion to commit all NRA resources against efforts to restrict or prohibit any firearms or ammunition. Screaming on exposure, the NRA Board tabled our motion. NRA quietly agreed to the Administration's executive ban on import of certain semiautomatics.

In 1990, the Federal Gun-Free School-zone Act became law. #6 Concerned only with social image, police support, and sporting use of arms, NRA ignored constitutional rights. #7

In 1991-92, to counter the Waiting Period Bill, NRA promotes the police supported INSTANT BACKGROUND CHECK to buy a gun. #8 Thus NRA confirms claims people buying guns are a problem. So, the House defeats the NRA bill to pass the Sarah Brady Waiting Period Bill. #9

Virginia wants a Waiting Period with its year old Instant Check. #10 Expect states to shift clearance costs from police budgets to firearms purchasers.

January, 1991, I unsuccessfully try to substitute a fair, universal background check of driver license applicants. Reserve the letters, N, S and V for the license serial number to show narcotic, sexual and violent felony type convictions on the driver's license. The DRIVER LICENSE CHECK fits the new NRA CRIME STRIKE PROGRAM.

DEFYING YOUR FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS, the March, 1992 *American Rifleman*, instructs members to limit political testimony to approved, preselected NRA and State Association speakers.

Expediency, not principles, guides the NRA. Manipulative tactics, without philosophy, loses the battle for public opinion. Muscle, without logic, is losing politically. WE ARE LOSING OUR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS BECAUSE OF THE NRA. #11

Today the NRA is best symbolized by the Mexican piñata stuffed with goodies, the papier-mâché goat the party goers (The Self-Interests) break to get their treats (power, money, and recognition)

References and Notes.

#1 This describes the situation in Colorado.

#2 See "Gun Politics in

1934", *Machine Gun News*, July 1989

#3 The Firearm Owners' Protection Act, Public Law Number 99-308, became law May 19, 1986.

#4 Public Law 99-408, August 20, 1986, regulates the manufacture, import or sale of armor piercing ammo.

#5 See the article by Sargeant Gordon Robertson, *American Rifleman*, May, 1991,

#6 See *Federal Law Criminal Handbook*, 1991, Gould Publications, Binghamton, New York.

#7 See the NRA's September 14, 1990 testimony by James J. Baker on H.R. 3757, the Gun-Free-School-Zone Act of 1990, to the Subcommittee on Crime, House Committee on the Judiciary.

#8 See "Sheriff Makes A Point: Instant Background Checks Work", May, 1991, *American Rifleman*.

#9 See Associated Press Report, May 9, 1991 (*Rocky Mountain News*, July 23, 1991: "Gun Lobby No Longer Invincible.")

#10 Wayne LaPierre's report to the Public Affairs Committee, April 10, 1991

#11. I gave this article to Pres. Robert Corbin, EVP Wayne LaPierre and Neal Knox at Sept., 1992 Board Meeting. Ignored by Corbin and LaPierre. Knox only said (at meeting) "I don't agree with you."

Ed.: Lovell, an NRA board member from 1980 to 1993, wrote this article in 1992. Ten years later the NRA hasn't begun to restore the freedoms it has bartered away.

It's the Constitution, Stupid

Since the New Deal, Americans have slowly forgotten that the Constitution puts great limits on what the federal government can do.

As recently as the 1950s, people could still question whether the federal government ought to build a national highway system. In order to justify that program constitutionally, it was called the National Defense Highway Act.

Today, of course, any notion that such a program would need that sort of constitutional veneer to gain passage is absurd. Bush can help himself and his tax and budgetary plans by trying to reinvigorate constitutionality as a

rationale for his actions. Programs that do not rest on a clear grant of constitutional power should be abolished or transferred to the states. He can even argue that tax rates that are too high violate the Constitution's prohibition against unlawful seizure.

-- Columnist Bruce Bartlett

Disorder in the Court

Q: Did you stay all night with this man in New York?

A: I refuse to answer that question.

Q: Did you stay all night with this man in Chicago?

A: I refuse to answer that question.

Q: Did you ever stay all night with this man in Miami?

A: No.

Q: James stood back and shot Tommy Lee?

A: Yes.

Q: And then Tommy Lee pulled out his gun and shot James in the fracas?

A: (After a hesitation) No sir, just above it.

Q: Did he pick the dog up by the ears?

A: No.

Q: What was he doing with the dog's ears?

A: Picking them up in the air.

Q: Where was the dog at the time?

A: Attached to the ears.

Q: Mrs. Jones, is your appearance this morning pursuant to a deposition notice which I sent to your attorney?

A: No. This is how I dress when I go to work.

Q: You say you're innocent, yet five people swore they saw you steal a watch.

A: Your Honor, I can produce 500 people who didn't see me steal it.

Q: Please state the location of your right foot immediately prior to impact.

A: Immediately before the impact, my right foot was located at the immediate end of my right leg.

In the beginning of change the patriot is a scarce man, brave, hated and scorned. When his cause succeeds, however, the timid join him, for then it costs nothing to be a patriot. – Mark Twain

Before we recess, let's listen in on one last exchange, involving child:

Q: And lastly, Gary, all your responses must be oral, O.K.?

A: Oral.

Q: How old are you?

A: Oral.

Historian's failings have impact today

By Thomas Shapley, March 14, 2002

The spotlight of peer and public scrutiny has fallen on Michael Bellesiles (pronounced "Buh-leel"), the Emory University professor who wrote the book *Arming America: The Origins of a National Gun Culture*.

Bellesiles' alleged transgressions are, if confirmed, relevant because his historical thesis has become part of the contemporary public policy debate on the Second Amendment.

The world of American historians held its collective breath in anticipation of a review last month by four prominent scholars in a forum in the prestigious *William and Mary Quarterly*.

Three of the four solicited essays raised serious questions about Bellesiles' work. David Garrow, a Pulitzer Prize-winning Emory University colleague, told *The Atlanta Journal and Constitution* that "cumulatively, those three essays make a powerful case for a charge of scholarly incompetence, of being so blinded by the light that he rode roughshod over anything that didn't propel him toward the light."

Bellesiles has admitted he made errors in the book and corrections have been posted to the paperback edition.

Emory University has called for a formal investigation into allegations against Bellesiles.

One of Bellesiles' defenders is Dr. Arthur Kellermann, Director of the Center for Injury Control at Emory University's School of Medicine.

Kellermann's allegiance presents an opportunity to challenge a long-cherished belief of gun-control advocates that Kellermann himself fomented in a 1986 report. Along with co-author Donald Reay, then King County medical examiner, Kellermann suggested that an individual who keeps a gun in the home is 43 times more likely to kill a family member than an intruder.

The report was based on a study of firearms deaths in King County during 1978-83.

Those in the gun-control community took the study and rushed to sweeping judgments about the safety risks of guns in homes. In their rush, they failed to note at least one important caveat from Kellermann: "Mortality studies such as ours do not include cases in which burglars or intruders are wounded or frightened away by the use or display of a firearm. Cases in which would-be intruders may have purposely avoided a house known to be armed are also not identified... A complete determination of firearm risks versus benefits would require that these figures be known."

Unnoticed, too, was the fact that 84 percent of the in-home deaths was the result of suicide, irrelevant to crime or self-defense issues.

And look at the type of households that made their way into Kellermann's report. Fifty-three percent had a history of a family member being arrested. Thirty-one percent had a household history of illicit drug use; 25 percent reported alcohol-related problems; 32 percent contained a household member hit or hurt in a family fight. It's wrong to make an ideological point by playing fast and loose with history, whether the history is colonial or contemporary.

-- Thomas Shapley is an editorial writer and member of the Seattle *Post-Intelligencer* Editorial Board.

Ed.: for more on Bellesiles defender Kellermann see "The Favorite Factoid" on page 1.

Fawning Critics Don't Say Book Was Fraud

By Prof. Glenn Harlan Reynolds

In the fall of 2000, professor Michael Bellesiles of Emory University published his book *Arming America*, which purported to establish that the core historical argument behind the Second Amendment was a fraud.

The brave minuteman armed with his trusty rifle, Bellesiles told us, was mostly a myth -- Americans at the time of the Revolution, and for many decades afterward, seldom owned guns, but instead relied on the government for protection.

Bellesiles received glowing reviews in the *New York Times Book Review*, the *New York Review of Books*, the *Atlantic Monthly*, and many other publications,

Bellesiles turns out to have quoted sources out of context, to have falsely reported data, and to have claimed to have used documents that have not existed since the 1906 San Francisco earthquake. One historian familiar with Bellesiles' work called it a case of "bona fide academic fraud." Emory University is investigating.

Book review editor Karen Sandstrom of the *Cleveland Plain Dealer* has written that the positive reviews that *Arming America* received are evidence of a serious problem in the way American book review editors do their job, especially with regard to books that fit the editors' preconceptions.

Yet despite all these problems with Bellesiles' work, many of the publications that afforded his book so much laudatory attention when it came out have remained silent.

The *New York Times* belatedly ran news reports on the Bellesiles scandal, after it was broken by the *Wall Street Journal*, the *National Review*, and the *Boston Globe*. But the *New York Times Book Review* -- for whom Garry Wills wrote on Sept. 10, 2000, "Bellesiles deflates the myth of the self-reliant and self-armed virtuous yeoman of the Revolutionary militias" -- has published nothing on the subject (nor has Wills).

The *New York Review of Books* has not published a retraction. Nor have the *Christian Science Monitor*, the *Atlantic Monthly*, *Publisher's Weekly*, *Book Magazine*, the *Los Angeles Times Book Review* and Columbia University's history department, which awarded him the Bancroft Prize in April of 2001.

To its credit, the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, an academic newspaper that featured Bellesiles on its front page when *Arming America* first appeared, gave similar front-page treatment to the books problems. But not many have followed its lead. Why?

-- Glenn Harlan Reynolds is a law professor at the University of Tennessee and publishes InstaPundit.Com.

Ed.: Bellesiles has just been awarded a new \$30,000 grant from

the National Endowment of the Humanities, to write another book about guns, according to National Review March 3.

The NEH gave money to the Newberry Library in Chicago, which gave the money to Bellesiles.

Army Fields Lighter Body Armor

THE U.S. Army has introduced a new "flak jacket" that weighs 35 percent less than the current body armor.

The Interceptor Body Armor will replace the Personnel Armor System, Ground Troop, which is considered outdated after more than 15 years of service.

"The PASGT was fielded in the early '80s and met the requirements it was intended for," said LTC Steve Pinter, project manager for enhanced soldier systems. "Technology has afforded us the opportunity to field a more capable system at a considerable weight savings."

The 16.4-pound IBA system consists of a tactical vest and a pair of protective inserts. The Kevlar vest includes detachable neck and groin guards, while the ceramic plates slide into pockets on the front and rear.

By itself, the IBA vest insulates a soldier from shrapnel and 9mm pistol rounds. When the protective inserts are added, the system acts as a ballistic barrier to 7.62mm rifle ammunition.

By comparison, the PASGT weighs one-half pound more than the IBA vest and only offers defense against fragmentation. The PASGT can be upgraded to stop 7.62mm rounds by teaming it with the Interim Small Arms Protective Overvest. However, the combined weight of the two systems tilts the scales at 25.1 pounds.

Regardless of the situation, the Interceptor system is an effective defense against rifle projectiles and shrapnel from mines, grenades, mortar shells and artillery fire.

Soldiers began receiving the new body armor in late 1999. -- U.S. Army Soldier Systems Center, Natick, Public Affairs Office

World Court Now a Reality Will supersede national sovereignty, even of countries refusing to ratify

NEW YORK - The International Criminal Court was officially instituted April 11, 2002 at the United Nations headquarters.

The court, a permanent tribunal to prosecute "crimes against humanity," strides onto the world stage without the ratification of the United States. Deemed by some as a grave threat to national sovereignty, the United States has lodged strenuous objections to the ICC. As late as Monday there were reports that President Bush had sought means to retract the signature of former president Clinton, who signed the treaty on his last day in office. A signature indicates a nation's intent to seek ratification.

However, the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee would not bring the treaty to the Senate for a vote.

Objections to the court by Americans are based largely on fears that such a court could bring politically motivated charges against U.S. presidents and military personnel. Crimes of "aggression" have not as yet been defined, leaving open to future interpretation any number of military operations. When one nation defends itself, is that aggression against another? So-called crimes against humanity include vague phrases such as injury to a population's "mental health." Who is to determine when such a crime has been perpetrated?

Any U.S. citizens prosecuted by the International Criminal Court will be denied the guarantees of the U.S. Constitution.

U.S. treaty specialists underscore the unique danger of the ICC: It is not a treaty among parties in agreement, but is instead a new, and many believe dangerous, species of an international instrument that subordinates all nation states in the world to the rule of the United Nations' court. The ICC can prosecute whenever it deems a nation's courts have failed to prosecute its own violators of "human rights." Never before has such power been held over nation states, say court critics.

Opponents of the ICC cite as an example of U.N. interference in domestic matters the April 4 report by U.N. special rapporteur on judges and lawyers Param Kumaraswamy. After a six-week investigation, Kumaraswamy accused Italian politicians of "interfering in the country's justice system." The

rapporteur demanded a reform of the Italian justice system.

American supporters of the ICC dismiss those objections as "overwrought." Clinton appointee David Scheffer, former U.S. ambassador for war crimes, described the institution of the court as a "significant moment in world history." Scheffer, who was Clinton's point man for the ICC negotiations, now serves as senior vice president of the United Nations Association of the USA, a U.N. advocacy group.

The mechanism for charging citizens without the cooperation of their government - including those nations, such as the United States, that have refused to ratify the treaty - requires that charges be brought by the United Nations itself on behalf of another nation, ethnic group or non-governmental organization.

The court will formally open for business July 1 in the Netherlands where temporary quarters for the court have been secured. The ICC cannot retroactively prosecute crimes under its jurisdiction. - *WorldNet Daily*

Tyranny of the Minority

Sixty-six of the world's 191 countries created the International Criminal Court (ICC).

The population of those 66 countries is 973,506,988. The population of the world is 6,157,400,560.

The ICC was created by less than 35% of the countries of the world having less than 16% of the world's population.

'Panic Room' Hideouts Becoming More Common

Hundreds of Bay Area residents have a real-life "panic room," which real estate insiders used to call safe rooms before the hit movie starring Jodie Foster came out.

Some are converted closets with doors that bolt shut from the inside. Others have secret entrances that are impossible to detect unless you know where they are.

And a few are similar to Foster's fortresslike hideout in "Panic Room," or even more intricate, with heat-sensing cameras, multiple ventilation systems and chemical washbasins for scrubbing away biohazards.

In Los Angeles, most A-list celebrities and entertainment executives have safe rooms, said Bill Rigdon, who is a vice president of Building Consensus, a company that builds the hideaways.

In "Panic Room," Jodie Foster's character and her daughter are accosted by three bumbling thieves.

Mother and daughter hide in a large armored space with security cameras, a toilet and enough provisions to stay put for weeks -- as the bad guys use a Home Depot franchise's worth of tools to try to break in.

Al Corbi, who has been designing safe rooms since 1971 in Los Angeles, said the makers of "Panic Room" got it right.

The "Panic Room" safe room is encased in several feet of concrete and steel.

Modern builders use sealed Kevlar, plastics and other light materials.

"Thirty years ago, you could only put one of these things on the ground floor, unless the building (was made of) reinforced concrete," Corbi said.

"Nowadays you can put them anywhere you want, cost-effectively."

Corbi said the eight black-and-white security monitors in "Panic Room" would be replaced by one computer with split screens. And Rigdon said the cameras themselves, which are visible in the movie, would be camouflaged.

In "Panic Room," Foster breathed the same air as her attackers. Modern safe rooms have several filtered ventilation systems to keep occupants safe from smallpox, anthrax or other biological weapons.

Corbi said safe rooms are becoming obsolete. Most new high-end homes are designed with safe "cores," in which an entire section or even the floor where the occupants sleep is cut off from the rest of the

residence.

"If someone wants to get into the house, they can get into the house," Corbi said. "(But) with a safe core, they can't get near you."

Some Los Angeles safe rooms border on excessive -- Rigdon talks about the Sultan of Brunei's plans for a 100,000-square-foot underground hideout.

But Corbi said he's created a safe core in a home for \$15,000, and is serving more middle-class homes.

While Foster's room was filled with snacks and blankets, one suburban LA woman's room looks like a weapons factory. On a recent Friday, she had two rifles, two handguns, pepper spray and enough ammunition to quell the next 10 prison riots at Pelican Bay.

"They had less firepower in the movie," she said, hefting a small Beretta handgun. "My theory is, pepper spray in my left hand and gun in my right."

She had no idea her house had a safe room until it was in escrow. For safety reasons, real estate agents tend to hide the location until they know a buyer is serious.

While Rigdon said his company had a large increase in business after Sept. 11, Bay Area buyers weren't asking about safe rooms until after the trailers for "Panic Room" started rolling a few months ago.

Now he gets four or five calls a week and is advising custom home builders to plan for a safe room. -- San Francisco *Chronicle*, Apr. 8, 2002

Death of an American Nazi?

Carl F. Eifler, who commanded the first Office of Strategic Services covert operations unit during World War II, has died at 95, in Salinas, CA.

Eifler, dubbed "the deadliest colonel," devised plans -- that were later cancelled -- to assassinate

Chinese leader Chaing Kai-shek and to kidnap Hitler's top atomic scientist.

The OSS was the precursor of the Central Intelligence Agency.

"I broke every law of God and man, but I never did anything for personal gain," Eifler said at an Association of Former Intelligence Officers convention in 1983. "I was out to win the war for my country, and you can't fight a lawful war. I think the CIA today has gotten a lot of bad publicity. Where do you want them to get information? From churches?" -- Los Angeles *Times*, April 20, 2002

Jersey's Illegal Fees

New Jersey gun owners got some good news and some bad news following a successful lawsuit brought to stop illegal fees from being charged to people applying for a firearms owner identification card.

Applicants in seven counties (Sussex, Passaic, Morris, Essex, Union, Mercer and Camden) had to pay an illegal fee for a mental health background check.

The kicker, however, is that gun owners have to know about the decision and then go to small claims court to get their money back. There will be no checks automatically written.

The counties said they should not be required to pay the money back because they had already used it. Perhaps Jesse James could have used the same argument.

The court found that the counties had broken the law, but no government official will pay from his pocket or risk any jail time. -- Gun Owners of New Jersey, April 5, 2002

NJM, P.O. Box 10176, Trenton New Jersey 08650

ISSN 1523-4657

www.njmilitia.org

militia264@aol.com

walnor@keepandbeararms.com

Middlesex County, Art (732) 607-0833

Wake Co, NC, Dave (919) 363-9410

Morris County, Bill (973) 361-3241

Newsletter Subscription - Donation \$10.00

Cash or Blank Money Order Only

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____